



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Classical Philology

VOL. III

*October, 1908*

No. 4

## IS THERE A SCIENCE OF CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY?<sup>1</sup>

BY FRANCIS W. KELSEY

One day in March, 1776, in Göttingen, a young man of seventeen presented a note of introduction to Christian Gottlob Heyne, the first classical scholar of the time, whose bulky edition of Virgil, revised by Wagner, is still frequently referred to. With an air of impatience, we are told, the older man came from his study and having glanced at the note asked the youth whose foolish advice he had followed in making so perverse a choice of work as the pursuit of so-called "philology," which had as yet not even a standing as an academic subject; a student of such tastes must perforce choose as his department theology or law. The young man, taken aback, answered that he desired the larger freedom of a field in which he could work out his own views without being hampered, as in theology, by the restrictions of a ready-made system. "But," urged Heyne, "that line of work leads to starvation;" adding that even the professors fared little better; that in Germany there were at most only four or six good university positions in this field. Undaunted, the youth replied that he purposed to fit himself for one of these.

About a year later the young man presented himself for matriculation to the prorector of the university, a famous professor of medicine in those days, Dr. Baldinger. He offered

<sup>1</sup> President's address before the American Philological Association at a joint meeting of this Association and the Archaeological Institute of America at The University of Chicago, December, 1907.

himself as a student of philology, *Philologiae studiosus*. Shaking with laughter the prorector declared that there were students of medicine, also of law and theology, yes there were even students of philosophy; but who ever heard of a student of philology? If it was his ambition to become a schoolmaster—and from this might the good Lord deliver him!—he must enroll as a student of theology. In the face of opposition and ridicule, persistence won the day, and his enrolment was accepted.

That fearless and determined student was Friedrich August Wolf. His matriculation introduced a new term into university nomenclature; the date of it, April 8, 1777, one hundred and thirty years ago if we reckon back from the opening of the last spring quarter, was the birthday of classical philology.

It has ever been the fashion to look upon leaders of power, whether in the domain of ideas or of affairs, as men gifted with a kind of occult knowledge who, because illumined by an inner vision, were ordained to blaze trails for the masses. It were more exact to say that all leadership is in final analysis a product of conditions. Ideas and ideals germinate, and are disseminated; like all manifestations of racial or national impulse they are half-formed, inchoate. Then arises the poet or the preacher, the artist, the philosopher, the scholar or the statesman, who through deeper insight apprehends more clearly and brings the idea or ideal, present in many minds as an indistinct aspiration or glimpse of truth, to full and forceful expression. The leader is thus a revealer of life to itself, the interpreter, not the creator, of conditions of which he is a part. And it is no disparagement of the power and service of Wolf, any more than of other intellectual or moral leaders, to say that he was by no means a bolt out of a clear sky. The generation of David Hume and Jean Jacques Rousseau, which claimed Voltaire as an elder colleague, and as younger members Winckelmann and Immanuel Kant, had poured new wine into old wine-skins. Wolf represented, for a portion of the field of learning, the same widening of horizon, the same general reaction against tradition and authority which manifested itself in encyclopedism, and in the storm-and-stress movement of German literature. In the sphere of government it found

expression, in our country, in the Declaration of Independence and the Revolution; in France it burst all restraining barriers in 1789. At the very time when Wolf was trying to sate his intellectual hunger with the husks of the traditional university instruction, Washington was facing starvation for his half-clad forces at Valley Forge.

The services which Wolf rendered not merely to classical philology but to philological studies in general, cannot easily be set forth in words. Things for which he stood, which to his contemporaries appeared radical and revolutionary, are now commonplace of the lecture-room, and seem to us as if they must always have been so. And though regarded as the founder of a new order of studies, he left no unchallenged and abiding contribution; he set forth no universal law, as did, for example, Sir Isaac Newton, who by formulating the law of gravitation had laid an immovable cornerstone for the sciences of matter. Of Wolf's *Prolegomena* to Homer, which started the controversy in regard to the authorship and composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, hardly a conclusion is today recognized as valid—the argument rests largely upon the assumption that the art of writing was unknown at the time when Homer was supposed to have lived; the controversy, nevertheless, still continues. Less frequently mentioned are his arguments against the authenticity of certain orations of Cicero, particularly the four associated with the orator's return from exile and that for Marcellus, arguments which were inspired, he tells us, by the doubts of the English scholar Jeremiah Markland. With what confidence, in his address to the reader at the beginning of his edition of the *Marcellus*, does he state his conclusion:

Account must be taken [he says] of those things that offend the reader, and the writer must be so struck down by a single blow that no hope of recovering his position will be left to him. And this I think I shall have accomplished if I shall show that the oration (for Marcellus) is devoid of substance; that in respect to the choice and collocation of words, and in its constructions, it is often hardly Latin; that the composition as a whole is inept, silly, and laughable; in fine, that it is more worthy of the addle-pated Claudius than of Cicero.

Does any editor today deem it necessary to reckon with Wolf before undertaking to expound the *Marcellus* or the *De domo sua*? So completely has the authenticity of the entire group of obelized speeches been vindicated that only historical interest now attaches to the considerations urged against them. The inconclusiveness of the attempts to impugn their genuineness presents a sorry contrast with the masterly decisiveness of Bentley's *Dissertation on the Epistles of Phalaris*, which introduced a perpetual guest into the limbo of discredited literary forgeries.

The pigmy, mounted on the giant's shoulders, can see further than the giant himself; and it has been the usual fate of contributions to knowledge dealing with large masses of detail that sooner or later they have been superseded by the work of others who, building on them as a foundation, have been able with the progress of research, and improvement in working method, to bring under survey a wider range of facts. Does it lessen the value of Charles Darwin's formulation of the theory of organic evolution that his doctrine of natural selection, within a half-century after it was put forth, is in the light of fuller knowledge held to be untenable? We may grant that all of Wolf's writings, which were at best only fragments of large undertakings planned but never executed, contain but little that is of use to the student who has the recent literature of the classics at his command; the fact serves only to bring out into a clearer light the value and influence of the new conception of the province and range of classical studies which he elaborated and put forth. He sought to grasp not merely classical literature but classical antiquity. He endeavored so to group and unify the different lines of study in language, institutions, literature, and art as to make it possible to survey the field in its entirety, and form a mental picture of ancient civilization as a whole. His aim was to reduce our knowledge of Greek and Roman culture in all its phases to a scientific coherence and consistency. The main elements of his doctrine, which he set forth in his university lectures, were given to the world by his students before 1800; in the year 1807 he published an outline himself. What better evidence could there be of the soundness of his contention than this joint meeting, which brings

together, in a city that in his time was only a stockaded block-house in the wilderness, so large a body of workers representing not merely philology in the narrower sense but classical antiquity as he conceived it, and much besides? Not without reason, then, may we regard this meeting of the American Philological Association and the Archaeological Institute of America as a centennial celebration.

Viewed in the light of a century's progress, Wolf's system on the logical or formal side is seen to be defective as the basis of a science; the grouping of the various departments of study is artificial, and is lacking in the clear recognition of a fundamental co-ordinating principle; there is also a confusion between method and matter. His scheme viewed the knowledge of classical antiquity as composed of twenty-four branches or lines of study, of which twenty-three are arranged in four groups. The first group is introductory, and brings together six subjects: a survey of the fundamental principles of both the classical languages; Greek grammar; Latin grammar; interpretation; criticism; and principles of Greek and Latin composition for both prose and poetry, or the theory of writing and metrics. In the other three groups are found, in general, the other subjects comprehended today in such a work as Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*, but not divided and subdivided according to the usage now in vogue. The twenty-fourth subject, set off by itself as a kind of appendix, is the history of the literature of classical philology, with which bibliography also is joined.

Associated with this comprehensive scheme there was of necessity a new point of view for the consideration of the Greek and Roman literatures. If the purpose of the reading of the ancient authors was not, apart from mere enjoyment, to prepare oneself for the study of theology or law, if they were to be viewed as contributing evidence for our understanding of the ancient man, they must not be merely read but critically examined; they must be subjected to the most rigid tests, not only for the facts of language but for the truth or falsity of statements of every sort found in them. This reactionary and critical attitude sent thrills of horror through the more conservative of Wolf's contemporaries, who had

reverenced the ancients as looking down upon modern life from a high pedestal, and had viewed the works of Greek and Roman literature as well-nigh faultless models of unapproachable excellence. It was most completely manifested in the *Prolegomena* to Homer, to which reference has already been made; but the world was ready for Wolf's message and the influence of that small book, we have often been told, was greater than that of any other purely philological work ever written. Classical studies began to have a new dignity and purpose. How generally they had been regarded as subsidiary to theology and, on the continent, to civil law it is not easy for us to comprehend; and, on the other hand, we often fail to appreciate the value of the services not merely of the Roman Catholic church but of the reformed churches to classical philology in the pre-Wolfian period. It was a papal stipendium which made it possible for Winckelmann to carry on his studies in Italy; and in the English universities, foundations which were primarily theological were liberally administered and had fostered the study of the classics. No one can turn the pages of the works of Richard Bentley without being impressed with the theological bent of his training; yet England has produced no greater master of the pagan literature. The broader conception of philological studies made current by Wolf's teachings caused the interpretation of the ancient culture to appear something worthy in itself, and emancipated classical philology once for all from leading-strings. It was a theologian, Adolf Harnack, who wrote of Wolf's exposition of classical antiquity as a science that "it took classical philology out of the vestibule of theology, lifted her over the ranges of polite literature, and founded for her an independent kingdom."<sup>1</sup> The inspiration of his ideals produced a profound effect upon his younger contemporaries; upon none perhaps more than Niebuhr, who applied the new criticism to the literary sources of Roman history.

Intellectual phenomena are rarely isolated; the same conditions stimulate minds in widely different environments. Viewing in a still broader horizon not merely the critical but the constructive work of Wolf as the founder of classical philology,

<sup>1</sup> *Geschichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, Vol. I, Pt. 2, p. 853, footnote.

we see that he was one of a group of men who about the same time set new landmarks in the history of the sciences; of whom it may justly be said that they prepared the way for the marvelous advance of knowledge that characterized the nineteenth century. When Wolf at Halle was elaborating his theory of the composition of the Homeric poems the botanist Antoine Laurent de Jussieu, dissatisfied with the classification proposed by Linnaeus, was developing the system of botanical nomenclature which forms the basis of that used generally today. Baron Cuvier, the founder of comparative anatomy, finished his *Anatomie comparée* in 1805. About the same time Dalton worked out his doctrine of the atom, which made possible the development of a science of chemistry, and which, reinforced later by the law of the conservation of energy, became the foundation stone of a new physics. In the same period the *Mécanique céleste* of Laplace, which has profoundly influenced the progress of mathematical astronomy, was in course of publication; and the great reflecting telescope of Sir William Herschel, mounted in 1789, was subjecting the heavenly bodies to a closer scrutiny than had previously been possible. As the origin of classical philology was only a phase of a general reaction, so its development formed a part of a larger scientific movement along constructive lines.

And how amazing that development has been! It is recorded partly in the literature, partly in those vast collections of material relics of Greek and Roman culture which exploration and excavation have in the past century gathered and stored. Several of the academies had been founded at the end of the seventeenth or the beginning of the eighteenth century, as the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres in France, the Royal Academy at Berlin, and the Imperial Academy of Sciences at St. Petersburg; but in the latter part of the eighteenth century and in the first half of the nineteenth these were either reorganized or revived, and several new academies were established. In the voluminous memoirs and transactions of nearly all of them, contributions in the field of classical antiquity have a prominent place. The academies have also assisted in the publication of important collections, as of inscriptions and of authors, a praiseworthy example



being the new Vienna collection of Latin ecclesiastical writers. Other collections, particularly of texts, have been put forth by enterprising publishers, often at a pecuniary risk which should not be lost sight of in estimating the value of their services to science; such collections, I mean, as that of the Byzantine historians, projected by Niebuhr and published by Weber in Bonn; of Greek authors issued by the firm of Didot, at Paris; of the Library of Greek and Latin writers put forth by the house of Teubner, in Leipzig; last (for only a few can be named) and also on a lower plane of scholarship, nevertheless an exceedingly useful collection, Migne's *Patrology*.

Not to mention the avalanche of individual contributions, of editions, handbooks, monographs of every sort, academic programmes and dissertations which, gathering volume with each succeeding year, has rolled down upon the opening decade of the twentieth century, we may note, as further evidence of the development of classical philology on the scientific side, the multiplication of technical periodicals, and their increase in bulk as well as importance. Here again Wolf was a pioneer. With Philipp Karl Buttmann he founded the *Museum der Alterthumswissenschaft*, in the first volume of which he published the outline of classical antiquity of which I have spoken; but only two volumes appeared. Not till 1826 was a periodical started which was destined to survive; in that year the first volume of Jahn's *Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* saw the light, a journal which through many vicissitudes and with some changes in name and form, has continued to the present day. In 1829, the publications of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome commenced. The decade from 1840 to 1850 witnessed the successful launching of no less than three periodicals that were devoted exclusively or chiefly to contributions in the classical field, the *Rheinisches Museum*, established on a firm foundation after two previous attempts (in 1827-29, 1833-38); *Philologus*, and the *Revue archéologique*; with these we might name also the *Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen*, which gave much space to the classics. Since 1850, and particularly in the past thirty years, the number of technical journals in the classical field—some of them devoted

to a narrow subdivision—and of serial publications issued under the auspices of learned societies and of universities, has increased with unprecedented rapidity. With mingled feelings of joy, pride, and dismay the classical scholar today views the tier on tier of pigeon-holes for current publications of his subject in the classical seminary or the library reading-room. That was not altogether a jest which was uttered by my former colleague Calvin Thomas, when, addressing a company of philologists of the modern field, he said: “If we keep ourselves abreast of the technical literature of our specialty, when shall we have time to improve our minds?”

But the influence of the scientific conception of philology, in the narrower as well as the broader sense first developed and applied in the classical field, has by no means been confined within the original limits. From the time of Sir William Jones, who died in 1794, there was an increasing recognition of the interest and worth of Sanskrit. Thirty years later Franz Bopp, associating the classical with the oriental Indo-European languages, became the founder of comparative philology. In 1829 Jakob Grimm commenced the publication of his *Deutsche Grammatik*, which laid the foundations of modern Germanic philology; and the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, founded in 1852, on the title-page of the first volume designated as its field German, Greek, and Latin. Since that time the range of data available for the student of comparative philology has been enormously extended, and the position of Greek and Latin has become relatively less prominent; yet the study of the classical languages will continue to be indispensable to the comparative philologist, because they furnish a long record of linguistic changes not so fully recorded in the case of languages more recently reduced to writing; and the classical scholar will constantly invoke the aid of the comparative philologist for the understanding of the development of Greek and Latin. At the present time modern European philology, with its subdivision of Teutonic, Romance and Slavic languages, has amassed a voluminous technical literature of its own, which likewise has many points of contact with that of the classical languages.

But if the aspect of the technical literature alone is bewildering, what shall we say of the myriads upon myriads of objects, recovered in the past century from the wreck of ancient civilization, which bear the very marks of the hands that wrought them? Buildings and structures of every sort and size, now found standing and tenantless in a Syrian waste, now exhumed slowly by the spade and reconstructed only in imagination; stamped handles of wine jars picked up on the shore of deserted Carthage, and exquisite painted vases from Etruria; bits of lead inscribed with cabalistic curses, and choicest examples of the art of the silversmith from Bernay or Hildesheim or Boscoreale; coins by the thousand, from the rude cast coppers of early Italy to the exquisite mintage of Athens or Syracuse; types of plastic art, from the child's toy, the crude *ex voto* and the daintily fashioned figurine of clay, to the very handiwork of a Praxiteles; brittle, tattered papyri, and now shriveled parchments, from Egyptian sand heaps; painted portraits from Egypt, polychrome sarcophagi from Sidon, mural decorations not merely from Campanian sites, but from points so widely separated as Delos and Caerwent; sacred precincts unearthed, as at Olympia and Delphi; whole sections of cities uncovered before our eyes, as in Pompeii and Timgad; marsh settlements in Italy with suggestions of Roma Quadrata and the arrangement of the Roman camp, graves of chieftains at Mycenae revealing a forgotten culture, a labyrinth in Crete; discoveries without number over a territory extending from the Atlantic to the Caspian and from the Sahara to the North Sea and Scotland, exemplifying conditions of life that succeeded one another over a period of at least two thousand years, and in some places over a much longer time! And that the task of the classical scholar, trying to grasp the ancient culture as conceived by Wolf, may not seem too simple, the ingenuity of a Champollion in solving the mystery of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, the heroic enterprise of Botta and Layard in opening up the mounds of the drainage area of the Tigris and Euphrates, the patience and acumen of Grottefend, Sir Henry Rawlinson and their associates and successors in searching out the key of the cuneiform writing, the persistence of Texier, Dieulafoy, and a score of other intrepid

explorers in penetrating to remote sites, have made possible the reconstruction, at least in outline, of other and hoary civilizations which cast their mantle over nascent Hellenism, which kindled the torch that Greece passed on to Rome, Rome to modern times. Philological scholarship has known no more fascinating problems than those that now lie, awaiting solution, along the border of the old Orient and the new Occident, in Asia Minor, Cyprus, and Crete.

And in how short a time has this expansion of philological knowledge taken place, an expansion made possible only by the application of scientific method, and such as the world never before witnessed! There are yet living, in the full enjoyment of their faculties, not a few persons whose childhood fell in the latter part of Wolf's lifetime—I have talked with two such within the past week; and Wolf was only 65 when he died, in 1824. The Behistun inscription was not copied in a manner to support the solution of the Cuneiform writing until 1837; that was, to be sure, the year of the founding of the oldest of the western state universities,<sup>1</sup> but the events of it do not seem remote, as they are called to memory in conversation. Even the life that has not reached beyond the scriptural threescore years and ten spans the interval between then and now; and in such a lifetime has come the chief part of the almost incomprehensible accumulation of new material and new literature of exposition and co-ordination in the domain of classical antiquity.

This expansion of knowledge such as Wolf, had he allowed his imagination freest range, could not have conceived, forces upon us the question, will his organization of the science of classical philology which, though defective in details, was in its main contention adapted to the state of learning in his time, continue to prove adequate under the changed conditions?

The most obvious defects upon the formal side of Wolf's system were in great part remedied by his most eminent pupil, August Boeckh, who lectured upon the theory and methods of classical philology in twenty-six semesters, during a period of fifty-six years, from 1809 to 1865; and who in a masterly contribution

<sup>1</sup> The University of Michigan.

dealing with Athenian public life illustrated by application the principles and methods which he taught. The fundamental conception, that our knowledge of classical antiquity may theoretically at least be reduced to such unity and coherence as to form a science, has in recent years rarely been challenged. The aim of this science is understood to be the ideal reconstruction of Greek and Roman culture; the methods two: interpretation, through which a clear understanding is reached of any survival of that culture which has come down to modern times; and criticism, through which effort is made to determine the original form of that which has been corrupted or deprived of parts in the transmission.

Leaving differences of nomenclature out of account as relatively unimportant, we notice that as an organized science classical philology is open to attack from two directions, from within and from without. In the first place, no agreement has yet been reached regarding the subdivisions and their relative importance. What Cicero says of the liberal arts, that they are all connected by a common bond, is applicable here; moreover, in any science dealing with social phenomena the demarcation of the allied provinces is not so clear as in the exact sciences, and a certain amount of overlapping is to be expected. As good a division as any is that which views the Graeco-Roman culture as revealed in six phases: first, language and literature (that is, of both Greek and Latin); then religion; public life, or man in his social relations, that is, the state, which treated analytically gives us the study of political institutions, treated as an organism adjusting itself to an environment yields history; private life, or man in his relations as an individual; the fine arts, as an embodiment of ideals of beauty in substance; and finally philosophy, as antiquity's own reflection upon its Whence and Whither, its attempt at solution of the world problem.

Not to speak of other shortcomings, what place is there left in such a scheme for archaeology? Obviously none, unless archaeology is limited to the history of the fine arts, or is considered as a subsidiary means rather than a division. The English tradition from Sir Charles Newton down, and to some extent the continental

usage, tend to lift archaeology, as the study which deals with the remains of man's handiwork in past times, to the level of an independent science co-ordinate with philology (in the narrower sense) and history; yet a moment's consideration will show how untenable is this view. The remains of man's handiwork have slight significance for us apart from the thought or purpose which lies behind them. When the purpose is the expression of beauty, the consideration of the object falls within the province of the fine arts, which is as properly a main division as is public or private life, or philosophy; but when the material relic serves only a lower or utilitarian end, as a block of stone carved with an inscription, a roll of papyrus, a bronze knife used in sacrifices, a Roman road, a farmer's mattock, or a collection of surgical instruments, its purpose and use obviously bring it to our consideration under purview of the province which it illustrates; the provinces for the objects named would be language, or language and literature, religion, public life, and private life. Can it not be urged that in dealing with all such material archaeology becomes merely an application of the general method of interpretation or exegesis? Into this complicated question, however, I cannot enter here; perhaps on some future occasion I may be permitted to discuss by itself the problem of the province and aims of archaeology. The manifest confusion in the connotations of this and other terms in the domain of classical philology is to be explained in part by the fact that power of assimilation has not equaled the rapidity of accumulation of new material.

In the preface of a recent book on the progress of classical studies in the past twenty-five years Wilhelm Kroll remarks that "today, fortunately," broad general surveys of the divisions of the classical field are no longer in fashion; and in the book itself he has grouped seventeen short summaries, by nearly as many writers, on the progress of various branches, as metrics, Roman literature, Greek grammar, Greek philosophy. These are thrown together without any attempt at logical order and without a word of generalization at the beginning or end of the volume on the advance of classical studies as a whole. Such a hit-or-miss ordering of material is unfortunately characteristic of much philological work

at the present time. With the rapid increase in the range and number of facts the subdividing of fields of study has gone on until many specialists have entirely lost their perspective and are no longer able to see the forest for the trees. Specialization has become a necessity; yet without a broad foundation and large outlook it defeats its own purpose. The conclusions of the narrow specialist are vitiated by his narrowness; "What does he know of England who only England knows?"

It must be confessed that the inner relations of classical philology are far from settled; yet each decade marks an advance in the definiteness and certainty of knowledge in all the provinces, and makes more clear their mutual interdependence. The danger of disintegration is on the whole probably less than that of dismemberment in a more general reclassification of the sciences which is, according to many indications, impending; and classical philology is in this respect no worse off than many other subjects. We seem to be drifting toward a regrouping of all the sciences concerned with man under the head of anthropology. It is instructive to turn the pages of the volumes entitled *Physical Anthropology* in the International Catalogue of Scientific Literature, and to glance through the recent volumes of the *Berliner Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Urgeschichte*; there are included not merely the references to literature dealing with man as a physical being, but also references and contributions touching every manifestation of his higher nature through language, institutions and the arts.

The foundations of anthropology are not yet laid with sufficient security to make a readjustment immediately necessary for our subject. Of greater concern to the classical philologist is the increasing comprehensiveness of specialization in certain provinces of anthropology which cut across his domain. Students of the history of art not without reason look upon the interpretation of the fine arts in the Graeco-Roman period as part of their task; the attitude of the student of the history of philosophy is similar. And from the opposite point of view the question is raised, whether the classical philologist can interpret the architecture, sculpture, painting, and minor arts of the Greeks and Romans

without a technical training and some familiarity with the whole history of art. How can he be expected to expound the ancient philosophy in a manner intelligible to the present age without a knowledge of the philosophical movements since the fall of the Roman Empire?

Without pausing to take up these questions in detail we may, I think, obtain a point of view from which the coherence of classical philology will become readily apparent. After all considerations have been weighed that make for its unwieldiness, its faulty subdivision, and its imperfect correlation with kindred sciences, it still remains the imaged microcosm of a single civilization, which politically, it is true, passed through two characteristic phases and was, broadly speaking, based on two ethnologically distinct dominant or controlling populations. The provinces of classical philology represent the avenues through which racial and national thought and impulse found expression in language and literature, cults, institutions, customs, art, and philosophy. A perfect command of all these would enable us perfectly to understand the ancient man, who, though separated from us by the lapse of so many centuries, is very near to us in spirit. The evolution of thought and enlargement of experience may regroup sciences as it will; the work of the classical philologist as the interpreter not merely of language but of a culture cannot be dispensed with so long as mankind shall have regard for the past. Cults and works of art and speculative systems are no less forms of national self-expression than letters and government; and no one of them can be fully understood except in the light of all the others. How pitiable, as a rule, are the attempts of those who have not had a broad and thorough classical training to set forth either ancient art or ancient philosophy, or even ancient history! And the student can make no greater mistake than to suppose that he can become a trustworthy expositor of the classical literature without knowledge, accurate and systematic so far as it goes, of all the other parallel manifestations of the Graeco-Roman spirit. On the other hand, language and literature are the most plastic, many-sided and complete of all possible forms of national self-expression; and many a younger classical scholar who has become imbued



with the desire to conduct investigations needs to be reminded that only by the constant reading of the great Greek and Latin authors can he hope to obtain that insight which is fundamental to the successful prosecution of his task.

I have spoken of classical philology as a science; but do not misunderstand me, I mean no pyramid of bricks. Bit by bit evidence is collected, sifted, and pieced together; but larger combinations are effected, as in all sciences, by the constructive imagination, and a final test of every reconstruction of antiquity is its vitality. If we can gain the point of view of the Greek or the Roman, with his heredity, his atmosphere, his superstitions, his ambitions, his inquisitiveness, his sensitiveness to beauty of form, and his ethical ideals, Athens and Rome will for us be no longer peopled with lay figures, and we shall have taken a long step toward our goal.

In one respect the American classical student has a peculiar coign of vantage. From our kindred across the sea we have the tradition of the classics as humanities, that they should be read primarily to be enjoyed, and for their refining influence; thence, too, from time to time come books in our own tongue that manifest an appreciation of ancient literature so delicate and yet so deep that they are at the same time a revelation and an inspiration. But side by side with this humane ideal we have the scientific, introduced from the German university, which we have sought to superimpose upon the American college of English origin. The function of art in all its forms is to please; and he who is lacking in appreciation of art whether manifested in the literary masterpiece or in the monument is thereby disqualified for the scientific study of either, because unable to comprehend its purpose. Herein lies the opportunity, the call of American classical scholarship, that it blend together into one both the humane ideal and the scientific, and thus create a new type, which shall be as strong in sympathy and appreciation as it is broad, exact, and thorough.

It is a laudable ambition for the well-equipped classical scholar that he should desire to make a contribution, to add, if only an item, to the great sum of knowledge; to leave behind him some-

thing defined and proved both new and true, and worth knowing. But no matter how narrow the field which he may choose for special attainment or how restricted the area of investigation, especially if he be also a teacher he must never forget that he is to his day and generation an interpreter not of an isolated group of phenomena, but of a civilization, which in its better moments rose to ideals that are akin to those of our day because we have them as an inheritance; and he should never lose sight of that higher mission of classical study defined by an American, who knew much of its spirit if not also of the letter, as the accumulation, upon the present age, of the influence of whatever was best and greatest in the life of the past.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN